

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Status of the Claims:**

Claims 1-43 are currently pending in the application. The Examiner objected to claims 18, 25 and 42-43 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1-17, 19-24 and 26-41 were rejected in the Final Office Action.

Claims 1-43 have been amended herein. Claim 44 has been added, and is now presented for consideration by the Examiner. No new matter has been added, and thus, entry and consideration is respectfully requested.

### **II. Allowable Subject Matter:**

The Examiner objected to claims 18, 25, 42 and 43 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants acknowledge the indication of allowable subject matter in at least claims 18, 25, 42 and 43, and reserve the right to amend the claims later in the prosecution.

### **III. Response to Double Patenting Rejection:**

Claim 1 stands rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,522,513. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, the Examiner alleges that the pending and patented claims are not patentably distinct from each other because similar subject matter has been claimed.

In response to the double-patenting rejection, Applicants now submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to U.S. Patent No. 7,522,513 as suggested by the Examiner.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the double patenting rejection now be withdrawn.

**IV. Response to 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection:**

Claims 1-17, 19-24 and 26-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maja Sliskovic, Signal Processing Algorithm for OFDM Channel With Impulse Noise (hereafter, “Maja”) in view of Digital Video Broadcasting (DVB), framing structure, channel coding and modulation for digital terrestrial television, ETSI EN 300 744 V1.1.1, January 1002, Cover and pp. 2-49 (hereafter, “ETSI”). In particular, the Examiner alleges that the above claims are obvious in view of the combined teachings of Maja and ETSI.

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the claim amendments and remarks presented herein. For example, amended claim 1 now recites:

1. (Currently Amended) A method, comprising:
  - detecting a presence of at least one impulse interference within a multi-carrier signal,
  - blanking samples where significant amount of the impulse noise caused by the at least one impulse interference is present to obtain a signal with blanking,
  - determining an estimate of the signal with blanking,
  - determining carrier correction values, which carrier correction values are based on deviations of certain carrier values compared to prior known information, and the blanking, and
  - performing correction of the estimate without Inversion Fast Fourier Transform or feedback circuitry so as to influence the estimate by the carrier correction values to obtain a representation of a desired signal.

Support for the amendments presented herein may be found in at least paragraph [0027] of the published application (US 20060116095 A1). The amendments presented herein attempt to further distinguish the claimed embodiment of the present invention from the cited references, taken alone or in combination. More specifically, the Examiner previously stated in section 9 of the January 29, 2010 Final Office Action, *“In response to the above mentioned arguments, Examiner agrees that the present invention does without use of matrix calculation or doing FFT transformation twice. But, it is not claimed. Regardless of it does matrix*

*transformation and FFT twice the result will be the same as claimed.”* As a result, Applicants have attempted to incorporate the elements that the Examiner stated were missing into the claims by including the limitation “performing correction of the estimate without Inversion Fast Fourier Transform or feedback circuitry so as to influence the estimate by the carrier correction values to obtain a representation of a desired signal.” Applicants now believe that claim 1, as amended, is distinguishable from the teachings of the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully assert that at least amended claim 1 is distinguishable from the Maja and ETSI references, taken alone or in combination. The other independent claims have been amended in a manner similar to claim 1, and thus, are asserted to be likewise distinguishable. Any other pending claim that is not specifically addressed above is distinguishable at least for depending from the pending independent claims. Thus, Applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection to the aforementioned claims now be withdrawn.

#### **V. New Claims:**

Claim 44 has been added and is now presented for consideration by the Examiner. New claim 44 finds support in at least paragraphs [0045]-[0068] of the published application (US 20060116095 A1). New claim 44 depends from amended claim 1, and thus, is distinguishable from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, at least based on the above remarks.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of the claim objections/rejections and allowance of this application.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 504827, Order No. 1004289-198US (4208-4226).

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 504827, Order No. 1004289-198US (4208-4226).

Respectfully submitted,  
Locke Lord Bissell & Liddell LLP

Dated: April 23, 2010

By:



---

Elliot Frank  
Registration No. 56,641

**Correspondence Address:**

Locke Lord Bissell & Liddell LLP  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101  
(212) 415-8600 Telephone  
(212) 303-2754 Facsimile